

Tracts in America 37

L E T T E R

TO THE
RIGHT HONOURABLE
WILLOUGHBY BERTIE,

BY DESCENT
EARL OF ABINGDON,

BY DESCENT
LORD NORREYS;
HIGH STEWARD of Abingdon and Wallingford,

IN WHICH
His Lordship's Candid and Liberal Treatment of

THE NOW
EARL OF MANSFIELD,

Is fully vindicated.

By birth a Peer, a Steward high by place,
With nice precision parcels out the state;
Wielding aloft the politician's wand,
Mansfield a Devil; Rockingham a God:
E'en to the teeth of Power he bold maintains.

L O N D O N,

Printed for T. PAYNE and Son, T. CADELL, and J. SEWELL,

MDCCLXXVIII.

[Price One Pound Scotch.]

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation

To the R E A D E R.

THE rank of a commentator, and the value of a commentary, should, as to us it seemeth, bear some proportion to the dignity of the author, and the value of the work, which that Commentary is intended to elucidate. Upon this account it is, that, meaning, in the following letter, to comment on the works of a Peer, and of such a Peer, we could not condescend to affix a price in the vulgar terms of shillings and pence; but we determined that the denomination of the sum should be high, and noble. And in this we consulted the dignity of our author. But at the same time we determined to qualify that denomination by the word *Scotch*: and to this we were induced by two very cogent reasons; the first whereof is, that the subject of this part of our noble author's work is a

THE

TO THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE

WILLIAM PITT

OF GREAT BRITAIN

PARLIAMENT OF GREAT BRITAIN

BY DECREE

LORD MORRIS

HIS GRACE THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE

AND



IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED

IT IS ENACTED

That the said Duke of Devonshire
doth hereby certify that the
said Duke of Devonshire
doth hereby certify that the
said Duke of Devonshire

LONDON

Printed by T. BAYNE and SONS, Stationers, Strand.

1801

Printed by T. BAYNE and SONS, Stationers, Strand.

To the READER.

THE rank of a commentator, and the value of a commentary, should, as to us it seemeth, bear some proportion to the dignity of the author, and the value of the work, which that Commentary is intended to elucidate. Upon this account it is, that, meaning, in the following letter, to comment on the works of a Peer, and of such a Peer, we could not condescend to affix a price in the vulgar terms of shillings and pence; but we determined that the denomination of the sum should be high, and noble. And in this we consulted the dignity of our author. But at the same time we determined to qualify that denomination by the word *Scotch*: and to this we were induced by two very cogent reasons; the first whereof is, that the subject of this part of our noble author's work is a

Scotchman; and the second, that we might thereby consult the œconomy of our readers. Unlike in this to our worthy friend, and fellow-labourer, the renowned John Wilkes. For the reader is to know, that a certain number of speeches of the aforesaid John Wilkes having lately been collected "*from newspapers and oral tradition,*" they are published at the moderate price of six shillings. The editor, that is, the speechifier, assigneth two reasons for making and publishing this collection: but to use our noble author's phrase, "the first, the chief, the great" reason of all, he hath omitted: We will therefore supply it from oral tradition. And it is this. It was necessary to raise supplies for the aforesaid maker and publisher of Speeches. To raise the said supplies, with that versatility, for which this great man is so notorious, he determined to follow, whilst he pretended to reprobate, the conduct of ministry. He laid a tax upon all the good subjects of his

his majesty, who loved to drink the pleasant juice of sedition ; even as the ministry laid a tax upon all the American subjects, who love to drink the pleasant juice of tea. And herein the coincidence of our said friend with the present abominable ministry, is yet farther remarkable : for as the Americans were not compelled to buy, or to drink of, the juice of the noxious herb, so neither are we compelled to buy, or to read, this collection of Speeches.

But to return to our noble author. In the short specimen of his literary and political abilities, which we here present to thee, reader, there are certain peculiar graces of style, which cannot fail to prepossess thee in his favour. Modest as we are, we cannot refuse this testimony to our own merit ; we have laboured, and we trust not unsuccessfully, to form ourselves upon the model of our great Original. We have attempted here and there to illumine by the flash of pun ; to har-

harmonize by the jingle of conundrum :
 to soften by the artful aid of apt alliteration :
 to dignify by quotation ; and to
 interest by frequent allusions to Scripture.
 We do not indeed pretend to equal our
 author in Right Honourable Wit ; We
 are of an inferior order ; and have caught
 only a corner of his divine mantle. It is
 our noble author's exclusive right to
 Write thoughts ne'er thought but by a peerless Peer.

That we may not be suspected of flattery, we have extracted the passage, on which we mean to comment, from the fourth edition of our noble author's truly valuable and instructive work. It follows here prefixed to the letter. Commending the which to thy most serious perusal, candid reader, we bid thee heartily farewell.

* * * * *

“ Having attended my duty in the
 “ House of Lords upon every important
 “ debate respecting America, it was there
 “ that I derived much useful information
 “ to myself : but yet, however instructed,
 “ as

“ as I truly have been, by the wisdom of
“ those who opposed the measure of a
“ destructive civil war, I must confess,
“ my mind has been more made up on
“ this subject, by what has *not* been
“ said by the advocates for it, than by
“ what has been advanced against it.
“ The *first*, the *chief*, and the *great*
“ *champion* of all, for this calamity to a
“ country, has been the *now* Earl of
“ Mansfield : but his being so, was to
“ me, at the very first sight, an argument
“ against the war ; for his Lordship is no
“ *warrior*, and therefore I supposed that
“ if he had been more competent to the
“ events of such an undertaking, he had
“ been less *sanguine* in his recommenda-
“ tions of it. Let us see, however, what
“ his arguments were. The first point
“ to be settled was, which of the two
“ countries was the *aggressor* ; and of
“ course which was to blame : but this
“ would not bear a dispute, for in the year
“ 1764, when all was peace and harmo-
“ ny between both countries, this coun-
6 try,

“ try, by its Stamp-Act, flung the first
 “ stone at America, and so (the year 1766
 “ excepted) Great-Britain continued this
 “ stoning of America, like as Stephen was
 “ stoned, to the year 1775 ; when, by
 “ Negroes and Indians, the Americans
 “ were to be *scalped* and *flayed* alive, even
 “ as Bartholomew was ; and, in both in-
 “ stances, perhaps for the same reason :
 “ for Stephen and Bartholemew were
 “ *Saints*, and the Americans were called
 “ Dissenters, and Dissenters are cursed,
 “ by some Church-of-England-Men, as
 “ *Saints*. To get rid then of this stum-
 “ bling-block, of *aggressorship*, some-
 “ thing was to be devised ; and this
 “ something was, that America meant
 “ to become independent of this coun-
 “ try : But how was this to be support-
 “ ed ? The learned Lord proved it by
 “ *inuendoes*, by *sayings* and *doings*, *à priori*,
 “ out of the American Assemblies ; from
 “ Montcalm's Letters, which have been
 “ found to be forgeries ; and from
 “ Kalm's Travels, who made a voyage
 “ to

“ to America in the year 1749, and who
 “ says, that he was *there told*, that “ the
 “ English Colonies in North America, in
 “ the space of thirty or fifty years, would
 “ be able to form a state by themselves,
 “ independent of Old England.” But
 “ here I must beg leave to make an ob-
 “ servation or two. Supposing Mr. Kalm,
 “ in his Way to North America in the
 “ year 1749, had come into England,
 “ and on his arrival had been *told*, that
 “ there were men in this country who
 “ *on their bare knees had drank the Pre-*
 “ *tender's health* ; would not the inference
 “ have been just as fair to say, that this
 “ country meant to put the Pretender on
 “ the throne of this kingdom, in exclu-
 “ sion of the present family, as to say,
 “ what Mr. Kalm does say, that Ame-
 “ rica meant independency ? I think it
 “ would: for the question is not, what
 “ individuals say, but what is the sense
 “ of the nation. And it is plain it was
 “ not the sense of this country to put
 “ the Pretender on the throne, and I
 a “ hope

“ hope it never will, notwithstanding his
 “ health has been so drank, &c. &c. &c.
 “ &c. and what the sense of America was,
 “ appeared by the unanimous declaration
 “ of the people themselves in the most
 “ solemn and authentic manner. They
 “ say, through their Congress, (and if
 “ ever the sense of any people were
 “ taken, it was here found, for so free
 “ and general an election of Represen-
 “ tatives was never before known in the
 “ annals of the world) “ We *cheerfully*
 “ consent to the operation of such Acts
 “ of the British Parliament, as are, *bona*
 “ *fide*, restrained to the regulation of our
 “ external Commerce, for the purpose of
 “ securing the commercial advantages of
 “ the whole empire to the Mother Coun-
 “ try,” &c. &c. * It may indeed be said,
 “ that America has declared herself in-
 “ dependent of this country, and there-
 “ fore the prophecy of Mr. Kalm was

* Vid. Votes of the Congress, reprinted for J.
 Almon, opposite Burlington-house, Piccadilly, and
 also the last Petition of the Congress to the King.

“ true ;

" true ; but this does not follow ; for
 " this country, by putting America out
 " of the protection of its laws, forced it,
 " for self-preservation sake, into that
 " state of Independency. Admitting,
 " however, that America did mean In-
 " dependency, I will now ask, Were the
 " measures pursued the means to prevent
 " her becoming so ? I apprehend not :
 " For although the force of this country
 " be sufficient for conquest, ten times its
 " force would be insufficient to hold the
 " country in subjection. Three millions
 " of people, not only with their affec-
 " tions lost, but their inveterate hatred
 " gained, at three thousand miles over
 " the Atlantic, distant from the arm of
 " power, are not so easily held prostrate at
 " the feet of Parliament, as Lord North
 " was directed to say could be done.
 " No : One hour of justice and modera-
 " tion would have done more, than all
 " the German Blood-hounds hired from
 " all the German Traffickers of Blood, in
 " all the petty Principalities of Germany,
 " can atchieve in twenty years to come.

“ But to return to the learned Lord.
 “ Having set up Independency, and upon
 “ what grounds I have shewn, as the
 “ object of America; his Lordship
 “ argued, that the Rubicon was passed,
 “ that we should kill the Americans, or
 “ the Americans would kill us, and that
 “ we could not look back, but must go
 “ forward, though our destruction be cer-
 “ tain and inevitable. In short he drove
 “ us on, until we are all now driven,
 “ like so many asses, into a *Pound*; and
 “ are so *impounded*, that Thirteen Shil-
 “ lings Land-tax in the *Pound*, nay, all
 “ the *Pounds*, Shillings, and Pence in
 “ the Nation, will not *unpound* us. Such
 “ is our disgraceful, and truly to be la-
 “ mented, situation. The contempt of
 “ ourselves, and the mockery of all Eu-
 “ rope besides. Bullied by Frenchmen,
 “ insulted by Spaniards, memorialized by
 “ Dutchmen; and yet, happy would it be
 “ for us, if these were the only calamities
 “ that we are to suffer.”

LET:

L E T T E R

T O

L O R D A B I N G D O N .

MY LORD,

THERE is a part of your Lordship's very masterly performance, entituled—" *Thoughts on the Letter of " Edmund Burke, Esq. to the Sheriffs of " Bristol*"—which has, by many, been severely, but unjustly, censured. Whether it be from envy, or from what other motive, I cannot say; but there are, who have gone so far as to brand it with the unseemly epithets of—" ill-timed, " uncandid, illiberal." It is that part, my Lord, where you speak of the *now*

Occasion
of writing
this letter,

B

Earl

Earl of Mansfield (a). I thought, therefore,—thinking your Lordship fees, is catching—I thought I could not render a more acceptable service to your Lordship, nor a more useful one to the public,

(a) The author of “Second Thoughts” has severely handled many of our noble author’s Thoughts. I would not wantonly expose myself to his gripe. These unfortunate Thoughts, therefore, I must leave undefended. But I will venture to reprove this second thinker for his uncandid insinuation, that Lord Abingdon meant *any reflection* by giving to the word *now* “all the emphasis of italics.” Lord Abingdon knew the blood of the Murrays, though not subtilized by the volatile salts of Italy, to be at least as pure, at least as noble, as the blood of the Berties. What reflection could he then mean? No reflection at all. The emphatic *now* was suggested by the inbred modesty of diffident merit, as much as “by the inbred politeness of hereditary rank.” It is the voice of humility. “Rank me”—so his Lordship should be understood—“Rank me among those, who

“Nothing themselves, are of their fathers vain.”

“Remember my antagonist is a man, who, even
“had he not been so nobly descended, *would*

“Have *earned* those honours I was *born* to wear.”

than

than to send forth this short, but, I trust, full, defence of the passage in question. To encourage young speakers is among the merits of Governor Johnstone (b): be it among mine to encourage young writers. For many reasons I deferred the publication of this my Commentary to the present hour. The business of my profession gave me no earlier opportunity of perusing your Lordship's work with meet attention. I was willing, besides, to wait, till more editions than one had appeared: because I was willing to have your Lordship's cool, deliberate, Thoughts. For, I saw, your Lordship had offered the captivating excuses of incapacity and inability; the conciliating appeal to the candor of the world: In a first edition those excuses might have been troublesome; because they kept open to your Lordship a door of re-

(b) See Mr. Almon's account of the Governor's reply to a young Baronet at the opening of this session.

treat : in a fourth edition they are mere nullities ; all retreat is precluded. I may now, therefore, enter upon my task with greater boldness. Whatever it might be at the first, your Lordship's aim in submitting your Thoughts a fourth time to the public, must be "*to confute, not to be convinced ; to point out error, not to arrive at truth (c).*" For the sake of mutual ease I shall lay aside the pedantic stile of ordinary commentators, and follow the example of Mr. Burke. As he comments upon acts of Parliament, I shall comment upon the Thoughts of Peers, in the loose, desultory, stile of a letter-writer.

Effects of
Mr.
Burke's
letter.

What effect the Letter of Mr. Burke may have produced upon the good Sheriffs of Bristol, is more than I am able to determine. Be that as it may, great is the merit of this Letter ; immense the advantages, which this thrice happy

(c) See his Lordship's Thoughts, fol. 4.

country has already derived, and will, no doubt, continue to derive, from it. To have produced no effect on the Sheriffs of Bristol, would not detract from the merits of the Letter. Possible it is, as one of our adversaries has suggested (*d*), that “the understandings of Sheriffs may be “ slower than the understandings of all “ other his Majesty’s liege subjects; and “ the understandings of the Sheriffs of “ this same good city of Bristol slower “ than the understandings of the Sheriffs “ of all other cities.” A woolpack is said to be impenetrable to a cannon-ball; and so might be the heads of these Sheriffs to the impetuous momentum of Mr. Burke’s eloquence. But into penetrable matter the Letter forced its way. It did more than the learning, the instruction, the rod of a Markham : it produced effects, which neither the acquaintance of a De Lolme, the conversation of a For-

(*d*) See a Letter to Edmund Burke Esq. 2d. edit. printed for Cadell.

ster, the intimacy of a Vivian, were able to produce (e). It taught your Lordship to think: it emboldened you to publish your Thoughts to an astonished world. And here, as it was to be expected, its miraculous effects have ceased. I am not among those who think it ought to have

(e) It is certain, however incredible it may appear, that our noble author had the happiness of being educated by Doctor Markham; of being acquainted, conversing, travelling, with the three other gentlemen; the first of whom is well known by his History of the Constitution of England; the second by several political works, as well as by many able performances in his professional line; and, by the way, ought to be known, by a more distinguished rank in that profession: the third, alas! is dead.

I am sorry his Lordship yet remembers the smart of his master's rod. It may be dangerous to speak of it so publicly. Departed Kings are, among subjects, the best of Kings. Departed masters are, among scholars, the best of masters. In the eyes of scholars, to tell tales out of school is a high crime and misdemeanor: and ever, and anon, scholars, taking upon them to punish such crimes and misdemeanors, have used the birch as severely as masters. Caveat!

done

done more ; who think that to “ the pen
“ of a ready writer,” it should have
added “ the gift of tongues ;” should
have given your Lordship courage to
speak (f).

There are, I know, certain snarling,
ill-natured, critics, who think otherwise.

An ill-na-
tured ob-
jection
against
the Earl
of Abin-
don.

Mr. Burke's Letter, they say, was writ-
ten ; to answer that Letter in writing
was, therefore, regular, and in order :
but the Earl of Mansfield spoke ; spoke
there, where he ought to speak ; in his
place, in the house ; to the Earl, then,
they think your Lordship should have re-
plied by a speech ; there, in your place,
in the House ; and this, they say, would
have been regular, parliamentary : And for
want of this, my Lord, they will scarcely
allow you that merit, you so boldly chal-
lenge, of “ *having attended your duty in*
“ *the House of Lords upon every important*
“ *debate respecting America.*” To have

(f) To read a speech is not to speak.

attended your duty they conceive you should have done something more "*there,*" than to have "*derived much useful information to yourself:*" they think it an inadequate compensation, that you have now so kindly communicated this information to the world; all the merit, because all the use, of this information they conceive to have been lost, by the awkward mode of communication, by the ill-chosen tempora fandi. It was in the House, they say; while the torrent of his eloquence was yet rolling; ere it had hurried his Peers into the mad pursuit of vain hopes, and vain aims, that your Lordship should have boldly stood up to stem it: but, to stay till that torrent had borne down all before it; and then to come limping with the tools to make a dam—Oh! for that, they say, small thanks are due. As well, say these discontented mortals, might your Lordship have seceded with Mr. Burke; as well might you have staid in the country;

as come, while "*the bill was in its passage through the House,*" merely to let it pass in silence through the doors,

But objections like these cannot derogate from the value of your Thoughts. They serve only to prove the want of candor, or the want of knowledge, of the objectors. These silly, short-sighted, mortals did not see your Lordship's drift. It is one thing to instruct, another to persuade. The public you meant to instruct, and therefore you wrote: the House you meant to persuade, and therefore you were silent. For your Lordship persuades, even as you are persuaded,—in a new way; a way, peculiar to yourself—by the eloquence of silence—" *Instructed* "*you truly have been by those who opposed* "*the measure of a destructive civil war.*" —But you have been persuaded—for that I conceive your Lordship to mean by —"*having your mind made up*"—not "*by what has been advanced against it,*" but "*by what has not been said by the advo-*

This objection removed.

" *cutes*

cates for it." It may seem an odd maxim, that to persuade a man should be silent: and yet the example of our friend Burke confirms it. Though he, like the cit of Churchill,

Prove, and disprove, affirm and then deny;
Object himself, and to himself reply;
Talking himself into a little God;

Yet, strange to tell, he persuades no man. Your Lordship knew this; and, with your wonted sagacity, took the more persuasive mode of a pedarian senator, *Rap-
tim in sententiam concurrebas.*

A matter
of fact af-
firmed.

Having tried your art of persuasion in the house, with a laudable perseverance, you proceed to exert your talent of instruction out of the House. And the first piece of instruction, you give us, is delivered as a matter of fact—" *The first, "the chief, and the great champion of all, "for this calamity to a country, has been the "now Earl of Mansfield."*—

In

In this passage there is a very commendable obscurity; and I shall not so far deviate from the discretion of all commentators, ancient and modern, as to attempt totally to remove it. But a little glimmering of light you will permit me to let in upon it. To call a man a champion for a calamity, is such a whimsical confusion of ideas, that I am afraid it will only make our readers laugh: to make them a little grave, let us remind them, that by "*this calamity to a country*" your Lordship means "*a destructive civil war*:" And that by "*a champion*" your Lordship means "*a stout speaker (g)*." And this, my Lord, is all the information, which I think it expedient to give them. For I observe your Lordship's prudence: and whether the Earl of Mansfield meant, that the civil war should be destructive to this country, or to America, or to

Com-
mendable
obscurity
as to the
calamity
for which
the Earl of
Mansfield
was a
champion.

(g) Johnson defines a champion to be "*a stout warrior*:" but the Earl of Mansfield, as our noble author informs us afterwards, is no warrior.

both,

both, or to neither, but only to rebellion, is what your Lordship has prudently suppressed; and what I shall not be so imprudent as to reveal. This is a matter which we will leave open, in order that his enemies (for he is not a character to be without enemies) may take it, *comme de raison*, in the worst of all possible senses. It would not be amiss if they should suppose, that, in your Lordship's hearing, he stoutly argued for cutting the throats of man, woman and child, in England, Ireland, and America.

And as to
his being
the first
champion
for it.

For this same calamity to a country, mean it what it will, your Lordship informs us, the Earl of Mansfield was not only a champion, but "*the first, the chief and the great champion of all.*" Here again your Lordship is charmingly obscure. For whether you mean, that he was the first in point of time, or in point of argument, or in point of influence, you have left, and I shall leave, the world to guess.

But,

But, my Lord, with all your precaution, I am afraid you have advanced rather too far. I must not suffer your politeness, and generosity, to attribute so much to the Earl of Mansfield. I owe it to our cause, my Lord, to pluck from the brow of your champion the laurels you have placed there by mistake. For, in truth, neither in point of time, nor in point of argument, nor in point of influence, was he the first champion for a civil war. Honour to whom honour is due ! To Cæsar the things only which are Cæsar's ! The honour, your Lordship so liberally bestows upon the Earl of Mansfield, belongs chiefly to our friends Hancock, and Adams, and Franklyn : a little share of it to the "*honest*," the "*disinterested*" Rockingham ; a little share of it to the sesquipedalian Chatham ; a little share of it to the manly Barré ; and a very little, perhaps, to the mellifluous Burke (*i*). And thus, my

An honour
which
does not
belong to
him.

(*i*) No dispraise is meant to this honourable gentleman. He did all he could ; and no man is bound to do more.

good

good Lord, have men always argued on similar occasions. For instance; it was not to the late Duke of Cumberland, nor to the Council and Ministers of the late King, but to the Pretender and his adherents, that all the world, at another period, attributed the honour of being the first, the chief, and the great champion of all, for this calamity to a country.

A matter
of opinion
asserted.

The next piece of instruction, we receive from your Lordship, is delivered as a matter of opinion—" *But his being so, was to me, at the first sight, an argument against the war.*"—

Not current
at
Westminster
Hall.

Here, I own, your Lordship startled me. Accustomed, as I am, to go sometimes to Westminster Hall, I could not readily conceive, that the Earl of Mansfield's being of any given opinion was, at the first sight, an argument against it. For at Westminster Hall, my Lord, by a strange perversion of judgment, his being of any given opinion is, at the first sight, an argument for it.

How-

However, I soon saw, that the opinions at Westminster Hall were nothing to the purpose. Formerly, indeed, the constitution was considered as a part of the law. But your Lordship has made us wiser. For you, I think, my Lord, have traced the kindred of law and constitution; and clearly made them out to be different beings, related only as grand-mother and grand-daughter. Now, to be sure, a man may be very well with the buxom grand-daughter, and know nothing of the hoary-headed grand-mother. Well, therefore, as the Earl of Mansfield is acquainted with law, he may be a total stranger to the constitution: and what he may be, that it becomes our business to maintain that he is.

Opinions
there of no
weight.

And, indeed, I do not know, whether by the help of your Lordship's punning argument, we might not be able to render his acquaintance with law very questionable. One of the main proofs of it we may certainly destroy. For one of these proofs is, that
men

And more
over ill-
founded.

men chuse to bring their causes into that court where he presides. And this, say his friends, is, at once, a proof of his knowledge of the law, and of his integrity in the administration of it. And, at first sight, there seems to be something in this argument. But, after all, my Lord, this is only the opinion of men who are clearly in the wrong. For your Lordship knows, that men who go to law want right: and they, who want right, must, you know, be in the wrong. The opinion therefore of these men is the opinion of men in the wrong; and is, therefore, a presumption that he, whom they approve, is generally in the wrong, even in questions of law. Your Lordship sees, that, like a good commentator, I catch the spirit of my author.

Truth of
our au-
thor's opi-
nion de-
monstrated
from John
Wilkes.

Having got thus far, I fate me down to find out other reasons, why the Earl of Mansfield's being of any given opinion, on any question, should, at first sight, be an argument against it. I consulted John
Wilkes,

Wilkes; the very Coke of our system. I turned to his reports, vulgo dict. *North Briton*. From beginning to end, I found this unvaried language: "No man, who
 " was not born to the south of the Tweed
 " can have common sense or common
 " honesty." This is his grand postulatam: take this away, and you may throw his book into the fire. Here, then, we have a strong argument in support of your Lordship's opinion. For the Earl of Mansfield—let him deny it if he can—did suffer his father to beget him, his mother to bear him, and the midwife to bring him forth, on the other side of the Tweed. Therefore the Earl of Mansfield wants common sense and common honesty; therefore his being of any given opinion, is, at the first sight, an argument against it. Q. E. D.

From John Wilkes I turned to Jean
 Jaques Rousseau. He wrote a book, as
 your Lordship knows, on purpose to
 prove, that nothing is so destructive to
 C the

From Jean
 Jaques
 Rousseau,

the morals, or so ruinous to the understanding, of a man, as learning. Here again we stand firm, my Lord. The Earl of Mansfield is undoubtedly guilty of corrupting his morals, and ruining his understanding, so far as a thorough acquaintance with all polite learning, a comprehensive knowledge of history, law, and politics, can corrupt the one, and ruin the other (*k*). This his best friends will not dare to deny. I defy them. It is then as clear as the sun at noon-day, that your Lordship is in the right. The Earl of Mansfield is a man of learning : men of learning are always in the wrong : therefore the Earl of Mansfield is always in the wrong : therefore his being of any

(*k*) I hope the Earl of Mansfield is no mathematician. That is the only branch of learning which a good counsellor, and a wise peer, may cultivate. What an admirable use has my noble author made of it ! How clearly has he marked out the constitution, and the law, and the rights of government, and the power of the people, by the help of a pair of compasses, and the center, and the circumference, and the radii, of a circle ! He should have been first minister at Laputa.

given opinion is, at the first sight, an argument against it. Q. E. D.

I went a step farther, my Lord, I consulted the resolutions of those great judges, and consummate politicians, "the Society of the Bill of Rights," and "the Constitutional Society." The resolutions of these great men form our modern placita. And there it is constantly laid down, that to confound together things totally dissimilar, is essential to the character of a wise counsellor. Here again, my Lord, I feel my ground. The Earl of Mansfield, we all know, is distinguished by an acute penetration, and a discriminating judgment. Now the opinions of men of this description must, by our placita, be erroneous: therefore the opinions of the Earl of Mansfield are erroneous: therefore his being of any given opinion is, at first sight, an argument against it. Q. E. D.

Your Lordship is fond of mixing the familiar with the argumentative. After

From the
Constitu-
tional, and
Bill of
Rights,
Societies.

Triumph
of the
comment

this scientific demonstration you will allow me to say, then, that I chuckled over this discovery. With the old Grecian, I exclaimed, in triumph—*Eureka*.

Decisive
proof of
his opi-
nion given
by the no-
ble author.

But my triumph was of short duration ; I soon found, that I had not drunken deep enough of the Pierian spring. I am only a half-thinker. Your reason, my Lord, is the decisive reason—" *For his Lordship is no warrior.*" This is a sweeping stroke—It mows down all his Majesty's ministers at once. Lord North is no warrior. Down with him. Shall the King of a free country presume to be advised by any but soldiers ? To preserve our liberties, ought not the army to rule ? One man, indeed, there is, who holds a very responsible office in the Ministry, and who formerly was a warrior. But thanks to the pride, and the avarice, and the jealousy, of a little, paltry, beggarly German, man-butcher—that, you know, my Lord, is the style of the day, when we speak of German princes—Thanks
to

to these, I say, he is no longer a warrior.
Down with him too.

This reason, this decisive reason, my Lord, is however a two-edged sword. It must not, therefore, be trusted to the hands of a novice; or it may chance to wound, at once, our friends as well as foes. For, if the circumstance of being no warrior be, of itself, a conclusive argument against a man's opinion, what will become of the honest, the disinterested, Rockingham? What of the mighty Chatham, to whom, as your Lordship knows, the good Marquis has so lately turned over his dependents? What will become of the greater part of our friends? And, above all, what will become of your Lordship? For, I profess, I never heard of the battles you have won; or of the armies you have headed. This is an awkward dilemma: we must either give up your Lordship's reason; or stand exposed to this unforeseen misfortune. Give up the reason we cannot: and as to the

Danger of
urging this
proof.

misfortune, we must be content to soften what we cannot remove. Our friends, then, we must leave to do as they can : but I am too faithful a 'squire to leave my own knight in the scrape. For your Lordship, therefore, as in duty bound, I have found a way to escape from the horns of this uncouth dilemma.

Parried as
o our no-
ble au-
thor.

Though your Lordship be no warrior, in the common acceptation of the word, yet most certainly you have the distinguishing characteristic of one of the greatest warriors of antiquity. Who has not heard of *ποδας ωχους Αχιλλεως* ? Now, though you may not be, in your own proper person, swift of foot, yet, *quod possides per alium, possides per te* : The seisin of the lessee is the seisin of the lessor : The victory of the soldiers is the victory of the general. And so, my Lord, by parity of reasoning, the swiftness of the horse is the swiftness of the groom ; and the swiftness of the groom is the swiftness of the master. Clearly, there-

therefore, your Lordship possesses the characteristic of a warrior, a general, a hero. The enemy, therefore, cannot retort upon you and suppose—"if your
 " Lordship had been more competent to the
 " events of such an undertaking, you had
 " been less sanguine in your condemnation of
 " it (1)."

Your Lordship then goes on to sum up the arguments of the Earl of Mansfield. This is bold, my Lord, it is attacking him on his own ground; for to sum up arguments is his fort. But, my Lord,

How our noble author sums up the arguments of the Earl of Mansfield.

(1) Our noble author, citing Mr. Burke, substitutes—"incompetence" for "competence," "questionable" for "unquestionable." It was, therefore, allowable in me, his Lordship's commentator, to substitute "*condemnation*" for "*commendation*." But a learned friend has suggested, that this alteration spoils a pun; and very truly observes, that my noble author is fond of punning. He, therefore, advised me to restore the passage; and to read after the word undertaking "namely "a rebellion." And in their commendations of rebellion, my noble author and his friends have been truly *sanguine*.

though we may not have his talents, we have talents of our own. Well was it for your Lordship that you were so often whipt at school. Your classical learning may here do us knight's service. We remember, my Lord, to have learned, from Martial, that a man may so read the composition of another, as to make it his own.

*Quem recitas, meus est : O Fidentine, libellus ;
Sed male dum recitas, incipit esse tuus.*

We have only to go one step farther than the reader of Martial. We have only to mutilate the Earl of Mansfield's arguments ; to omit a few trifling circumstances, such as the time when, the occasion on which, they were adduced ; to add a little bit of our own ; and then, my Lord, though we cannot make his arguments ours ; we can do what will vex him ten times more, we can make our arguments his. At the very worst, we have only to serve him, as you have
served

served Mr. Burke, change an immaterial word or two; put "*incompetence*" for "*competence*," "*questionable*" for "*unquestionable*;" and our business will be completely done: we may make him say just what we like; just what he never said; and then send him to the devil for having said it. This premised, let us, as your Lordship says, see what his arguments were.

"The first point to be settled was, which of the two countries was the aggressor; and of course, which was to blame. But this would not bear a dispute."—That, originally, at the outset of the business, this was the first point which ought to have been settled is most undoubtedly true. Originally, at the outset, the Earl of Mansfield would have allowed it. And therefore, you know, we may fairly suppose, that then, when the business was so far advanced as it was, at the time he made the speech to which your Lordship alludes, he allowed it to be the
 "point"

As to the point of aggression forship.

“ point” which remained at that period, “ to be settled.” And this your Lordship must assert with the greater energy, because, in the speech to which you allude, the Earl of Mansfield declared, this was not the point which was now to be settled. And, in his unfair, uncandid, way, went on to prove, by different precedents, that in the midst of other wars, where we had been the aggressors, public good had compelled other Parliaments to prosecute such wars with vigor, until the object proposed could be either permanently secured, or with dignity resigned.

And the
indisputa-
bility
thereof.

“ That this would not bear a dispute” is likewise undoubtedly true: It is granted by us and by the Earl of Mansfield; it is granted on both sides of the Atlantic:—“ That you were the aggressors,” say we, with the flaming Americans, “ will not bear a dispute.”—“ That you “ were the aggressors,” says the Earl of Mansfield, with the sturdy Britons, “ will

“ will not bear a dispute.” And so, my Lord, on this, as on other indisputable questions, men go on to dispute. Reams of paper are used, floods of ink are exhausted, and, alas! rivers of blood may be spilt in disputing on this indisputable point. The truth you know is this; if men would but agree in their premises, they would soon agree in their conclusions; and then the matter would no longer bear a dispute. The premises, assumed by our enemies, are drawn from history, and acts of Parliament, and other such profane records; the premises, assumed by us, are drawn from purer and more sacred sources: From the gospels of Dr. Price; the epistles of Mr. Burke; and the apocalypse of your Lordship. Now we have only to suppose, that the Earl of Mansfield gave up his premises in deference to ours, as, no doubt, he ought to have done; and then you know, it follows, that he allowed, in our sense, that this point would not bear a dispute.

And

Lord A-
bingdon's
own
argument
that this
point was
indisputa-
ble.

And in truth, my Lord, this I apprehend to be the method your lordship meant to adopt. For you begin this paragraph by declaring, that you are about to see what are his—the Earl of Mansfield's—arguments. You then state what you conceive to have been the first point to be settled: and this point you tell us “would not bear a dispute.” So that I understood you to mean, that the Earl of Mansfield had given up his premises in deference to ours, and agreed, in our sense, that the point would not bear a dispute. But I soon discovered my mistake. For you go on to state our premises. And they are so true, express so prettily, in a style so peculiarly your own, that no man, who ever heard the Earl of Mansfield speak, could, for a single moment, have attributed one word of them to him. These are our premises. “For in the
“year 1764, when all was peace and har-
“mony between both countries, this coun-
“try, by its stamp act, flung the first stone
“at

“ at America, and so (the year 1766 ex=
 “ cepted) Great Britain continued the ston=
 “ ing of America, like as Stephen was
 “ stoned, to the year 1775: when, by ne=
 “ groes and Indians, the Americans were
 “ to be scalped and flayed alive; even as
 “ Bartholemew was: and in both instances,
 “ perhaps, for the same reason; for Ste=
 “ phen and Bartholemew were saints; and
 “ the Americans are called Dissenters; and
 “ Dissenters are cursed, by some Church-of=
 “ England-men as Saints.”

“ Nil admirari” was the advice of a
 Poet and a Philosopher: But I defy the
 whole host of Poets and Philosophers, ei=
 ther not to admire, or enough to admire,
 this elegant, elaborate, passage. It de=
 mandeth all, it surpasseth all, admiration.
 “ It is impossible not to be charmed with
 “ the happy prodigality of genius in its
 “ favor(m).” But amidst this prodigality

Adventi=
 tious or=
 naments
 of this ar=
 gument.

(m) The happy phrase of “ happy prodigality of
 “ nature” is happily applied by a happy prodigal to
 our

of charms, to which shall I first direct the attention of my reader ! Shall I point out to him the uncommon sources, whence your Lordship derives your political knowledge ! The Acts of the Apostles, the Lives of the Saints, and the Punster's Vade Mecum ! Shall I point out to him the candor, with which your Lordship insinuates, that the Earl of Mansfield is one of those bigotted " Church-of-England-men," who would broil a Dissenter for his breakfast, and roast all the family for his dinner ! Ah ! my Lord, if it were not for that blunderer Furneaux, such an insinuation would have been a noble hit ; But that fellow—I am almost ready to curse him, though he be a Dis-

our noble author. The Panegyrist well knew, there was another, and yet happier, kind of prodigality, which he had happily experienced from lower characters ; from the Townsends, and the Olivers, and the Bulls ; and which he hopes, peradventure, may hereafter give the finish to the *extravaganza* of our noble author.—See note to Wilkes's Speeches, vol. I. fol. 178.

senter

sender—must come with a certain speech in his hand, which breathes so pure a spirit of toleration, that all my art cannot pollute it. I cannot help it, my Lord; we must submit, and give up the brightest perhaps of our adventitious ornaments.

But your Lordship's main argument is safe: the veracity of your premises, the force, and the consequence, of your conclusions, these, the native beauties of your argument, remain in their full lustre: Against these, no Furneaux has any thing to oppose. The question to be decided is—"Which was the aggressor?"—That is, did Great Britain first invade the rights of America; or did America first invade the rights of Great Britain? "This question," your Lordship says, "will not bear a dispute," For, 'till 1764, all was peace and harmony between the two countries: that harmony was interrupted by Great Britain; namely by its stamp-act: therefore, Great Britain was the aggressor. If you please, my Lord, I will
put

Question
stated, and
argument
reduced to
a syllogism

put your argument into the form of a syllogism. A syllogism gives a scientific air to an argument: and, thus arranged, the present argument may become a more fit companion for your Lordship's mathematical demonstrations. Besides, whether a man be in the right, or be in the wrong, a syllogism is a most admirable weapon. Here then comes our syllogism.

“ That party, which first broke the
“ peace, was the aggressor:

“ Great Britain, by its stamp-act, first
“ broke the peace:

“ Therefore Great Britain was the ag-
“ gressor:”

If we prove the major and the minor of these propositions, the conclusion will follow as surely, as the Divine Legation of Moses from the premises of Bishop Warburton.

Proof of a
point as-
sume

But, my Lord, we will take warning from the Bishop. To him it was objected, by Dr. Middleton, that he had assumed a point, or two, which he ought to have proved;

proved; but by some accident forgot to prove. We too have assumed a point: But we will prove it. The point which we assume is this—"Till the year 1764, "all was peace and harmony."—Should this be disputed, I will defend it tooth and nail. To my dying hour I will maintain, that, so long as Great Britain asked nothing of America, nothing was refused her: that so long as Great Britain expended much in, and for, America, no remonstrance was made against, no attempts to put a stop to that expenditure, whether of treasure, or of blood: that Great Britain having equipt her fleets, and sent her armies, to defend the possessions, and extend the limits, of her fellow-subjects in America, those fleets and those armies were permitted to act. And is not this a state of peace and harmony between the two countries? and is not this the state of the connection between Great Britain and America, 'till the year 1764? Between those two countries

D

then

then, 'till the year 1764, was not all peace and harmony? As to the repeated attempts, on the part of America, to violate the laws of navigation; to injure their fellow-subjects in Great Britain; to throw off their dependence on the parent-state; they are nothing to us. Let us leave it to the Macphersons, and the Mauduits, and the Tuckers, and the Crofts, and and the Knoxes, to make what they can of them. Besides, these attempts were frustrated: The vigor of government, in those days, rendered them abortive. And, moreover, these attempts were made so long ago as the reigns of Charles, and of William, and of Ann, and of George the First, and of George the Second: They are antiquated tales. And, beyond all this, has not the infallible Orator assured that these were only the efforts of individuals? private attempts to break the laws, punished as soon as proved? And has not the great Apostle of our cause, the divine Dr. Price, asserted that

'till

'till 1764 all was peace and harmony? Has he not explained in what that peace and harmony consisted? Does he not tell us it consisted in this; namely that America was in the habit of acknowledging the authority of Great Britain: and Great Britain in the habit of protecting America?

This point, which we assumed, being thus explained, and thus proved, proceed we to the major proposition of our syllogism: viz.

Major
proposi-
tion of the
syllogism
proved.

“That party, which first broke the
“peace, was the aggressor.”

And here your Lordship will feel the advantage I meant to derive from, what Logicians call, the *determinative term* added to our proposition assumed; by which we limited and determined the meaning of *peace and harmony*, to the habit of protection on the part of Great Britain, and the habit of obedience on the part of America. Your Lordship knows the Earl of Mansfield, as well, perhaps, as

you know yourself. You will, therefore, imagine, that, without this precaution, he would have disputed every syllable of our major proposition. With this precaution, you will see, how glibly it goes down with him: he will admit it as self-evident. Little does he think of the fate which awaits him. Wide as is the *Ken* of the Thane of *Kenwood*, (n) he will not discover his danger till our aim be taken, the piece levelled, the trigger pulled, and the fatal ball have laid him low. And low will we lay him by the proof of our minor proposition. It is this.

The minor proposition proved.

“ Great Britain, by her stamp-act, first broke the peace.”

How so, may the Earl of Mansfield ask us: the highwayman, who demands the purse of the independent traveller,

(n) “ Odi imitatorum servum pecus.” But, “ pace tanti viri.” It is impossible for a commentator of genius not to imitate my noble author in the noble art of punning.

breaks the peace: but the Householder, who plants a vineyard, and hedges it round about, and digs a wine press in it, and builds a tower, and lets it out to husbandmen, and goes away into a far country, does not break the peace, though when the time of the fruit draweth near, he send his servants to the Husbandmen, that they may receive the fruit of it: the peace is broken by these Husbandmen, who take the servants of the Householder, and beat one, and stone a second, and kill a third: nor, if, after this treatment, the incensed Householder, should miserably destroy these wicked men, and let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, who should render him the fruit in their season, could he be said to break the peace. My Lord, let us grant him all this; let us leave him to the full enjoyment of his momentary triumph: and then let us ask his Lordship if he knows what the stamp-act was? Mark, my Lord, how we have staggered him. Now, down with him at

once: Tell him, my lord, tell him—it was a stone; and a scalping knife; and a tomohawk. Ask him, my Lord, if the first Servants of the Householder, instead of civilly asking the fruits of the Vine-yard, had taken the scalp, or the hide of the Husbandmen, or had beat out their brains, though with free stones, whether these Servants would not have broken the peace? See, my dear Lord, the advantages of candor! Our party know them well. By this timely display of it, how low have we laid our Enemy, this first, this chief, this great Champion of all!

Proved
over again

But let us give him time to recover. Though we have slain him, we will have the pleasure of slaying him again. And this I do, my Lord, to revenge myself of an ill-natured practice he has introduced into the Court of King's-bench. For your Lordship must know, that, when the arguments adduced on one side either make for, or do not make against, the adverse party, under pretence of expedit-
ing

ing business, the Earl of Mansfield stops the learned Counsel on the conquering side; and because some valiant Harry has slain a Hotspur, he will not indulge us, the Falstaffs of the law, in killing him over again. But we will let his Lordship rise again, on purpose that he may tell us that, if this act of Parliament be a stone, many a stone, out of the *same quarry* had been thrown at America, by the long parliament, by the parliaments of succeeding Princes, from Charles to the present Prince; that he may produce these stones; that he may urge the catching these stones to have been included in the habit of obedience, to have been the price of the habit of protection, of which we talked anon: and when he has done all this, my Lord, why then, we will not knock him down again, but we will do better: we will so entrench our argument, that he shall knock his own brains out in attempting to storm it. We will first call in our conclusion to prove our

premises, and then by our premises, we will prove our conclusion. As thus, my Lord, we will prove that Great Britain threw the first stone and broke the peace, because she was the aggressor: and then you know, my Lord, it follows of course, that she was the aggressor, because she broke the peace, and threw the first stone. This is generalship, my Lord; and, to do justice to your Lordship's merit, it is all your own. For thus it is, that you have rendered your argument impregnable: by intrenching it fast there, where your Lordship found the constitution, and the law, and the parliament, and the people intrenched. For all these, in a road, which many never suspected you to have travelled, "*in the road of demonstration,*" your Lordship found in a circle: (o) Fast intrenched in the same circle is your Lordship's argument: and there we will

(o) See Thoughts, folio 47.

send this stout Champion to force it, if he can.

As it was the point of aggressorship, which alone was to be proved indisputable, here your Lordship might have stopt. What follows, therefore, I presume your Lordship to have added, either *ex abundanti cautela* of the lawyer; or from the superabundant grace of the orator. These additional beauties, however, must not be thrown away upon the reader. With what a dextrous versatility does your Lordship shift your character! Is it necessary to ridicule a high Priest? Your Lordship adopts the arched eye-brow and Humean sneer of the unbeliever. Is it necessary to work on the compassion, or on the fears of some pious reader? You come out with a melancholy allusion to Stephen and Bartholomew; adopt the meek deportment of the modest Christian; and shed the holy tear over the manes of the suffering Saints. And in this, perhaps, you had
a far-

Versatility of our noble author.

a farther view : you meant to prognosticate the success of the Americans from the sufferings of their martyrs ; recollecting, I suppose, the cleanly allusion of one of the fathers ; “ *Sanguis martyr-
um semen ecclesiæ.*” To unbelievers, you knew, my Lord, this argument could never be addressed : they would surlily reply, that Stephen was stoned, and Bartholomew flayed, for doing what the Americans are doing : not for being Saints, but for attempting to overturn the constitution of a country.

Prudence
of our no-
ble au-
thor.

And yet once more, my Lord, how provident was your Lordship in reminding us, that this stoning ceased during the administration of the honest, the disinterested Rockingham ; during the year 1766. This was not only a well-timed compliment to him, it was a necessary excuse to yourself : Had his pure hand but thrown a single stone at the Saints of America, you must, you know, (for so you had rather rashly engaged) have
torn

torn "*the sacred deposit from your bosom ;*
" quitted the Marquis ; abandoned human
" nature ;" run wild into the woods ; and,
 even as Nebuchadnezzar, have eaten
 the grass with the oxen (p).

And be not alarmed, my Lord, at
 those timid friends, who may accuse you
 of rashness in speaking of *scalping* ; of so
 roundly declaring that the honest, the
 disinterested Marquis, threw no stone at
 our Saints. Should you be impertinently
 reminded, that the stone, which, in the
 estimation of the Americans, was the
 hardest, and the heaviest, of all hard,
 and heavy, stones, was thrown in the
 year 1766 ; by the hand of this very ho-
 nest, disinterested, Marquis : Should you
 be impertinently reminded, that the ex-
 ample of cruelty was set by the Ameri-
 cans ; should any thing be said about
 tarring, and feathering, and whipping,
 and googing ; should you be imperti-

Imperti-
 nent ob-
 jections
 removed.

(p) See our noble author's Thoughts, fol. 4.

nently

nently reminded, that the Congress first engaged the Indians to stand neuter, by ordering their Committees to furnish them with arms: Still do not be abashed, my Lord; maintain your ground; and, if you be too closely prest, call your ready friend, John Wilkes to your aid—he shall boldly assert for you, that to engage an Indian to be neuter, it is necessary to put arms into his hand; he shall boldly assert for you, that “*among all the various acts, of which the Americans,*” in a state of armed neutrality “*solicited the repeal, they never once made mention of the declaratory law (q).*” But I must stop short, my Lord; to point out all the beauties of this truly admirable passage would require the eloquence, and fill the volumes, of twenty Chrysostoms: It is of all fine passages, the finest I ever re-

(q) See his Speeches, made two years after this very law had been declared to be the greatest grievance.

member

member to have seen : and take it all in all, we shall not see its like again.

Having thus proved to us, that this point of aggressorship could not bear a dispute, your Lordship goes on, very consistently, to tell us how stoutly the Earl of Mansfield disputed it.—“To get

The Earl of Abingdon shews that the Earl of Mansfield disputed his indisputable point.

“rid,” you tell us, “of this stumbling-
 “block of aggressorship something was to
 “be devised ; and this something was, that
 “America meant to become independent of
 “this country : but how was this to be sup-
 “ported ? The learned Lord proved it by
 “inuendoes, by sayings and doings, à priori,
 “out of the American assemblies ; from
 “Montcalm’s Letters, which have been
 “found to be forgeries ; and from Kalm’s
 “Travels, who made a voyage to America
 “in 1749, and who says, that he was
 “there told, that the English Colonies in
 “North America, in the space of thirty or
 “fifty years, would be able to form a state
 “by

"by themselves, independent of Old England."

And disputed it stoutly.

Upon my word, my Lord, for a point, which could not bear a dispute, this was, however, stoutly disputed: It was disputed, you tell us, by arguments *à priori*; by sayings—meaning, I suppose, declarations—by doings—meaning, I suppose, acts—of the American assemblies; and these, I suppose, are arguments *à posteriori*. And, again, these arguments were explained by inuendoes; and abuted by the Letters of a French General, and remarks of a Swedish traveller. But, thanks to the great prowess of your Lordship! Arguments *à priori*, and sayings, and doings, and inuendoes, and letters, and remarks, are done away in a moment.

Letters of Montcalm forgeries.

Your Lordship, like a skilful General, begins by carrying the outworks. You knock down the buttresses before you attack the building. "*Montcalm's Letters have been found to be forgeries.*" By what

what jury have they been found ; by what witnesses have they been proved, to be forgeries ? Is any one impertinent enough to ask such a question ? Be not startled, my Lord ; answer boldly—by us. De notre plein pouvoir et seance certaine, we pronounce them to be forgeries. Is any one so impudent as to disbelieve you ? Lord Peter's argument is at hand :—
 “ Look ye, Gentlemen, I have said ;
 “ and he that believes me not, God Al-
 “ mighty eternally damn him and all
 “ his generation.”—So much for Montcalm. Should his ghost arise to avow the letters, we will conjure up the ghost of Wolfe, and send him packing to the shades again.

As to Kalm, he was a blockhead, he did not know, that the cool, deliberate, sentiments of the major part of the most sensible inhabitants of a country, through which he was travelling, were of no more weight, than the mad toasts of half a dozen boys just broke loose from school ;

Kalm was a block-head and therefore not to be heeded.

and enjoying themselves over the first bottle, perhaps, they had ever drunk.

At worst,
they were
both only
Prophets;
and there-
fore not
to be be-
lieved.

But take things at the worst: suppose the Letters of Montcalm to be genuine: suppose Kalm to have been (what, indeed, he appears to have been) a cool, and dispassionate, enquirer; an honest, and intelligent, traveller; to what do the Letters of the one, and the Remarks of the other amount? They amount only to prophecies: and what are prophecies to us? Here, if your Lordship pleases, we will quit the mask of the sober Christian, which we wore, when we talked of Saints; and take up the mask of the unbeliever. What then can prophecies prove? Why only this: That some old man, or some old woman, took it into his, or her, wise head, that a certain event was to happen within a certain time. Are they mistaken: does the event not come to pass? Why then you know—And here, if your Lordship pleases, we will flink back to the class
of

into two columns.

that their words have always a double sense : so that when they mean that any event shall come to pass, their cotemporaries are given to understand, that it is not come to pass. And, accordingly, we unbelievers know, that, in ancient times, when seers, and prophets, were as common as ballad-fingers, every man acted, as if he did not believe, or did not understand, one syllable they said.

The Earl
of Mans-
field's
main ar-
gument
divided
into two
columns.

Having thus carried the outposts, and routed the vanguard, your Lordship goes on to attack the main body of the Earl of Mansfield's argument. And this I understood from your Lordship to be divided into two columns : demonstrations à priori ; and demonstrations à posteriori. But, though I have reconnoitred the army of the enemy, as marshalled by your Lordship, with the best glasses I could procure, I have been able to discover but one of these columns ; the other, I am afraid, has marched off. Demonstrations

tions à priori, I think logicians tell us infer the effect from its cause: they are called demonstrations *τὸ διότι*: proving, not only that a thing does exist, but also why, and how it does, and must, exist. Demonstrations à posteriori go a surer way to work; and infer the cause from its effect: and they are called demonstrations *τὸ ὅτι*: because they are contented to tell us, that things are, and never trouble themselves about the why, and the how. It was from the defeat of the first of these columns, from the refutation of his arguments à priori, that I expected the completest victory.

But what your Lordship has done with these demonstrations à priori; or what you mean that we should take, or mistake for them, I really cannot say. Are we to suppose the *inuendoes* to be demonstrations à priori? But then your Lordship should have told us what these *inuendoes* were. For, you know, my Lord, much depends upon the arrangement of an ar-

His arguments à priori vanished.

gument, as well as of an army. And many a man, who would not fear any of the Earl of Mansfield's arguments, as arranged by your Lordship, might not feel so bold, if he were bound to attack them, when arranged by the Earl himself. You cannot mean the prophecies; which I supposed to form the out-posts, and the vanguard; and which your Lordship has already so completely routed. If your Lordship meant any thing else by arguments *a priori*, you have done more than vanquish them; with the witches of Macbeth, you have made them vanish into empty air (r).

(r) I should not be surprised, if some of our *hell-governed proscribers*, as my noble author politely calls the present ministry, should here exclaim, with my noble author's *Stentorian* voice, that the Earl of Mansfield did use very strong arguments *a priori*, to prove, that America meant to become independent of this country. That he observed, for instance, that the seeds of independence were sown in the original constitution of our Colonies; that Child, Davenant, and other the most penetrating writers of the then times, had seen the present effects

Let us then turn to his arguments a posteriori ; to direct assertions of independence ; to the actual exercise of independence ; to the sayings and doings of the American assemblies. But here again, my Lord, you have drawn us into a pe-
 effects in their infant causes ; that their sagacity had been justified by the early shoots which the seeds of independence had made even in the reign of King William ; that in the year 1733 these shoots had gathered such strength, that the late Chancellor Talbot proposed to check their growth by measures similar to the present : that, from that time to the year 1756 there was a continued and increasing tendency on the part of America towards independence ; that the conquest of Canada having removed the great check upon this tendency, the present events were predicted by many of the ablest politicians, native and foreigners.—Should this be urged, I have only to ask, What is all this to me ? I am not defending the Earl of Mansfield, I am commenting upon the Earl of Abingdon : it is my duty descriptas servare vices. It would, therefore, be out of character in me to see with any eyes but his. If my noble author has prudently dropt an argument he could not answer, I shall not be such a fool as to raise it up again. I have a right to make a witch, or a devil of it ; and send it into the clouds, or down to the shades, just as suits the purpose of my noble author.

His arguments a posteriori demolished.

rilous situation. You should have pointed out the very sayings and doings, which, and which alone, we were to suppose the Earl of Mansfield cited. You would naturally have selected the weakest, which you would have represented to be the strongest. By that licence, which is allowed to poets, and assumed by orators, your Lordship might have suppressed, or added, or explained, so as to have yet farther weakened the rickety things you had produced : even as your worthy friend, and truly honest compeer, the consistent Camden is wont to do. And thus, my Lord, we should have acquired a victory complete, sure, and cheap. But as it is, my Lord, our ground is very slippery. For of the records of the sayings and doings of these American assemblies, which have been consigned to us by our friend Almon, by far the greater part are too strong for our purpose. He was too wise indeed to publish the resolutions of Virginia and Massachusetts, prior to the stamp-

stamp-act. Nor did the honest, the disinterested, Marquis submit them to the inspection of Parliament. Of these therefore we will not talk : and I hope the Earl of Mansfield did not talk of them. Perhaps he cited those of Virginia in the succeeding year ; which declared, that “ the Colonies were not subject to laws “ made by Parliament, respecting their “ internal polity :” that is you know, among other things, respecting the trade from one Colony to another. Or, perhaps, he cited the circular letter of the Speaker of Massachusetts, to the several Assemblies, inviting them to form a Committee in general Congress from their own bodies, independent of the other branches of the legislature ; to consider and deliberate on acts of Parliament. That is, to consider, and deliberate how they might most effectually resist them. Or, perhaps, he cited the resolutions of the Assembly of New York, “ that the im-
“ practicability of inducing the Colonies

“to grant aids in an equal manner, pro-
 “portioned to their several abilities, does
 “by no means induce the necessity of de-
 “priving the Colonies of their essential
 “rights :” That is, of the right of not
 contributing at all. Or, perhaps, he cited
 the petition of New York against the
 commercial regulations made in the ad-
 ministration of the honest, the disinte-
 rested Marquis : or, perhaps, he cited
 the favourite doctrine broached in oppo-
 sition to another act of the honest, the
 disinterested, Marquis ; namely, “that
 “an act of Parliament, commanding the
 “colonists to do a certain thing, if it
 “have any validity, is a tax upon them
 “for the expence that accrues in com-
 “plying with it :” and therefore, “that
 “the Parliament had not the right to
 “compel them to execute it.” Or, per-
 haps, he cited the resolutions of the
 town-meeting at Boston in 1768 : “That
 “it is a violation of their charters, which
 “charters they ought to defend at the
 “ut-

"utmost peril of their lives, to raise, or
 "keep up, an army in the province,
 "without the consent of their assemblies:"
 that is, ever to station any troops in
 America. Or, perhaps, he cited their
 orders: "That every inhabitant should
 "provide himself with a well-fixed fire-
 "lock, musket, accoutrements, and am-
 "munition:" orders, you know, very
 proper when they meant to drive away the
 troops, and the officers, and the governors
 stationed by the King. Or, perhaps, he
 cited the petition of Massachusetts in 1770,
 to the House of Commons; asserting the
 Colonies to be, "by their nature and their
 "constitution, distinct members of the
 "commonwealth:" that is, you know,
 totally independent of Parliament. Or,
 perhaps, he cited the resolutions of the
 town of Petersham, "that the Parliament
 "usurping a legislative authority over the
 "Colonies, is against all law, human and
 "divine:"—Or, perhaps, he cited the
 orders of the town-meeting at Suffolk, in
 1774,

1774, "that the people perfect themselves in the art of war." "That the collectors of the taxes, and the holders of the public money, keep the said monies for the orders of the Congress." With a view, no doubt, by giving it back again, to prove their attachment to the Crown; and their obedience to Parliament.

By a saying of the Congress.

Whether he cited these, or stronger, sayings, and doings, of the assemblies, (and I assure your Lordship I have made a point of citing the weakest I could find) it was all nothing to the purpose. For what is one saying, or doing, of an American assembly, more than another saying, or doing, of an American assembly? Now, though the Earl of Mansfield did cite, or might have cited, these sayings and doings, and a thousand other sayings and doings, more full, and decisive. Yet we can cite one single saying (s) that shall blow all

(s) Let the reader observe the caution of my noble author. He does not touch upon the *doings* of
of

these insects away. And this saying, my Lord, shall be a saying of the Congress : and as the members of the Congress are not elected by the people at large, but are deputies illegally chosen by deputies legal, or illegal, they sit, and vote, notwithstanding what Dr. Price may tell us, by "*the most free and general election of representatives that was ever known in the annals of the world.*" And what is it this Congress says ? Why this : "*We cheerfully consent to the operation of such acts of the British Parliament, as are, bonâ fide, restrained to the regulation of our external commerce, for the purpose of securing the commercial advantages of the whole empire to the mother country.*" Can there be a stronger declaration of depend-

of this Congress : such as approving and resolving to support those who opposed acts of Parliament : exciting other Colonies to join in this opposition. Holding out to public detestation and abhorrence those who obey those acts, &c. &c. &c. For these doings were not to his purpose.

ence? Does not every subject, before he consents to the operation of an act of Parliament, take time to convince himself, that it is, *bonâ fide*, restrained to the regulation of such part of his conduct, as he chearfully submits to restraint? This saying, therefore, is a decisive proof that America never meant to be independent: notwithstanding all the sayings and doings cited by the Earl of Mansfield.

Use of virtual quotations.

Virtual representation your Lordship, no doubt, with the mighty Chatham, and the learned Camden, decries as the most nonsensical idea that ever entered into the head of a visionary. But, in polemical writings, virtual quotation is of singular use, and allowed practice. Thus your Lordship, by virtue of the two convenient &c. &c.'s has virtually quoted the explanatory part of this saying of the Congress.—For, anxious that these acts of the British Parliament, to the operation of which they so chearfully consent, should be enforced by proper sanctions,

tions, the Congress adds, —“ *excluding every idea of taxation, external or internal, for raising a revenue on the subjects of America without their consent.*” Hitherto, your Lordship knows, the acts for the regulation of their external commerce had been enforced by no greater penalties than fines, forfeitures, confiscations. The produce of these fines, forfeitures, confiscations, had served to raise a revenue on the subjects of America; and surely without their consent. Every such idea is now to be excluded. In their zeal for dependence, and to excite a chearful submission, the Congress meant, that these laws should be enforced by imprisonment, or corporal punishment, or perhaps by death itself. This we must maintain, my Lord; or we shall be told, that they meant only to submit to the operation of a law, which, for want of sanctions, could never operate.

Thus far I thought, my Lord, our victory was compleat.—We had beat him off

Unexpect-
ed oppo-
sition.

off the turf; him and his auxiliaries; his Davenant, and his Child, and his Kalm, and his Montcalm. Sweetly had I attuned my pipe to the sweet song of triumph, when up started another foe from a quarter, whence, of all quarters, I least expected a foe: even from amid the heroes, and the saints, of America. The author of "*Common Sense*," lost to all common sense, with all the temerity of profaneness, has torn away the veil, that hid the designs of our worthy Americans. Surely the days of witchcraft are returned: the man must have been possessed by many devils, when he published: that, "*He who is against the united independence of the Continent, is, to all intents and purposes, against her in all the rest; because this last comprehends the whole. And he may just as well say, that Britain was right in declaring her right to bind the colonies in all cases whatsoever.*"—Legions must have been in him, when he went on to say—" *It signifies*

*"nifies nothing what neutral ground of his-
 "own creation, he may skulk upon for shel-
 "ter; for the quarrel, in no stage of it,
 "hath afforded any such ground; and ei-
 "ther we, or Britain, are absolutely right
 "or absolutely wrong, through the whole (t)."*

Had the man but told us, with your Lordship, that the declaration of independence was no proof that the Americans meant independence; that they were surprised into it, forced into it; I should have adored him: but for him, so well acquainted with their measures, the director of their measures, the dictator of their declaration of independence; for him to come, and tell us, that, in no stage of the quarrel, hath there been a neutral ground: that the question has always been independence, or nothing; this is too much. I was confounded; my heart was smitten within me. I was

(t) See a paper written by the author of "Common Sense," called, "The American Crisis," N^o. III.

in as bad a plight as the good psalmist, when he was in the midst of waters, or in the midst of beasts, or in the midst of rottenness: and with him too I could only cry—" *It is not an enemy that hath done me this evil. (u).*" Your Lordship, perhaps, may be luckier: instead of the sensibility, you may possess the dexterity, of a David: and as our saints have been stoned, so you, by another stone, may stay this pseudo faint; this apostate Goliath! Mean time, let me again take shelter under your Lordship's wing.

A digression from the Earl of Mansfield.

The succeeding paragraph, being a digression from the Earl of Mansfield's argument, might have been considered as a hors d'oeuvre with respect to my design; which went no farther than to vindicate your Lordship's very candid and liberal treatment of that noble Earl; or, as your Lordship affects to call him, of

(u) The spirit of my author seizes me. His suffering Americans are saints; his discomfited commentator must be something like a faint.

that "*learned Lord.*" And in very truth, my Lord, I should have past it by, had I not perceived, that it held out to me a reviving cordial after the pain I had suffered from the profaneness of that uncommonly senseless writer, the author of *Common Sense*. For I soon perceived, my Lord, that, besides other collateral advantages, it afforded us a prolific fund of general, indiscriminate, censure: and general, indiscriminate, censure is the life and soul of our cause. It moreover affords us a most inviting opportunity of doing justice to the general line of conduct adopted by us, and by our friends. These are advantages by no means to be neglected.

"*Admitting,*" says your Lordship, "that *America did mean independency,* I will now ask, *Were the measures pursued the means to prevent her becoming so.*"

The Earl of Abingdon asks and answers a question.

A very shrewd question, my good Lord: as pertinent is the answer—"I apprehend *not.*" And truly, my Lord, I am most thoroughly, and heartily, of your Lord-

F ship's

ship's opinion. Nay, I will go farther, I will venture to say, that the Earl of Mansfield, if he would speak out, must avow himself to be of the same opinion.

Measures
like prophe-
cies.

For let us apply to measures, what we have said about prophecies. Of prophecies we observed, that, though fulfilled, they might, peradventure, be not true: but, if not fulfilled, beyond all peradventure, they are false. So of measures, if the end be accomplished, they may, peradventure, not be the means of accomplishing the end; but if the end be not accomplished, beyond all peradventure, they are not the means of accomplishing that end. The application of this argument, to use the strong expression of the French, *saute aux yeux*; the fairness of it, to use a phrase of your Lordship, will not bear a dispute. It is thus men reason in the most trivial, as well as the most important, concerns: thus they judge of gamesters, as well as of prophets, and of politicians: at billiards, for instance,

stance, a man puts the mace, or the queue, in what, he thinks, the proper direction; communicates to the ball what he thinks the precise momentum required to put it into the pocket. Does he succeed? It is not a certain proof of his skill; for the ball might have a bias, the table a declivity, which he did not know; or some Bystander might move, and encrease, or diminish, the momentum, or change the direction. Does he not succeed? That is a certain proof of his want of skill. The bias of the ball; the declivity of the table; the change of the direction; the increase, or diminution, of the momentum, are not admissible in extenuation of a charge, though very admissible in detraction from applause.

This allusion, my Lord, is not used barely to illustrate our general doctrine of measures, but applied with a more direct view to the particular measures, of which your Lordship declares, that you apprehend

Applica-
tion to
particular
measures.

hend them not to have been the means to prevent America becoming independent. For your Lordship well knows, that at the outset, Mr. Grenville, and after him, the present ministry, have been the players at this game, and we, and our friends have been the bye standers; who have changed the direction, and increased, or diminished the momentum, just as it suited our purpose. For your Lordship knows, and we all know, that, from their first establishment, the Northern Colonies have aimed at independency; that the very first act of the government of Massachusetts, after the grant of their present charter, was a direct, and formal, assertion of independency; that King William, not sufficiently aware of the consequences of this attempt, thought he did enough in disallowing this act; that, gradually undeceived by subsequent attempts, his Parliaments past other acts to vindicate their own authority, and confirm the dependence of the Colonies; that from his
 reign

reign to the end of the last war, there was a continual, though, to the vulgar eye, an imperceptible, struggle between Great Britain and her Colonies; the one asserting her supremacy; the other striving at independence. Soon after the close of the last war, the fire, which had so long been secretly hatching, had gained such a head, as to be ready, at the first breeze, to burst forth into a flame. That breeze was perhaps given by the stamp-act. Things, however, were not so far advanced; America was not yet so prepared, as to bid defiance to the power of Great Britain. Had Great Britain been as resolute and determined as America was bold and enterprising, all would have been well. America might, for a moment, have suspended, but would not have totally shaken off, the habit of acknowledging our authority. But the conduct of Great Britain was wavering, undetermined, fickle. She asserted the right; she asserted the fact; then she wa-

vered about the right; then again the right was asserted, but the fact surrendered; then again the fact was asserted, as well as the right: but, though asserted, it never was effectually supported. And so far your Lordship is certainly founded in declaring, what our enemies cannot deny, that the measures pursued were not the means to prevent America becoming independent.

Proofs of
our wisdom and
sagacity.

And this, my lord, is the highest panegyric upon the wisdom and sagacity of us, and of our friends. For to the wisdom and sagacity of us, and of our friends, is it owing that the conduct of Great Britain has been thus wavering, thus undetermined, thus fickle. For your Lordship may remember, that at the outset of this business, the gentle Conway, the narrative Barré, and the flannelled Pitt, excited the Colonists to resistance; rejoiced in their resistance; taught them to believe, what your Lordship's penetration has since discovered to be a fact, that "*al-*
though

“ *though the force of this country might be*
 “ *sufficient for conquest, ten times its force*
 “ *would be insufficient to hold America in*
 “ *subjection :*” taught them to believe,
 that “ *three millions of people, at three*
 “ *thousand miles over the Atlantic, distant*
 “ *from the arm of power,*” might safely
 defy the utmost efforts of that power (x):
 Your Lordship may remember, that the
 city Barons joined in the chorus of sedi-
 tion; and told the willing Colonists—
 “ Commands, which are given without

(x) Not to interrupt the thread of our argu-
 ment, we have lost some of the beauties of the pas-
 sage, as it was written by my noble author. Thus,
 with all the sharpness of Antithesis, he says,
 “ *three millions of people, not only with their affections*
 “ *lost, but their inveterate hatred gained;*” And again
 he says, with all the dignity of truth, “ *are not*
 “ *so easily held prostrate at the feet of Parliament, as*
 “ *Lord North was directed to say could be done.*” My
 noble author, it should seem, never goes to the House
 of Commons, but to hear Lord North say what
 was never spoken; nor to the Cabinet, but to
 hear him receive directions, which were never
 given.

" authority, should be heard without
 " obedience." Soon after the passing of
 the stamp-act, Mr. Grenville and his
 friends were removed; the honest, the
 disinterested Marquis, to the astonish-
 ment of all who knew him, appeared,
 all at once, at the helm. This short
 hour of administration, was, your Lord-
 ship will allow, "*an hour of justice and*
 "*moderation :*" that this hour "*did more*
 "*than all the German Blood-hounds, hired*
 "*from all the German Traffickers in blood,*
 "*in all the petty principalities of Germany,*
 "*can atchieve in twenty years to come ;*"
 Our enemies must allow ; and your Lord-
 ship may, at any time, prove, by the
 ready obedience paid to the only act,
 which commanded any thing to be done
 by the Americans ; to the only requisiti-
 tion, by which any thing was asked of
 them : And, lastly, by their grateful ac-
 knowledgement of the justice, and mo-
 deration, of the commercial regulations
 of the honest, the disinterested Marquis.
 The

The helm flipt from the hands of the honest, the disinterested, Marquis, almost as suddenly as it had crept into them : and then the consistent Grafton, and the upright Camden, and the immutable Chatham, changed their mind ; carried the right into act, presented to the throne addresses for coercion. Anon, they too were dismissed ; then, again the right became unconstitutional, the act tyrannical, coercion abominable ; then again America did right to resist. An honest Mussulman believes, that, when the Emperor gives places, their prophet supplies wisdom : Our friends, my Lord, are under the guidance of a prophet, who inverts the rule of Mohammed. Are they in power ? They do not very well know what they ought to do ; nor what they ought to maintain. They assert the right ; they abandon the right ; and they take it up again ; and they let it go again. Are they out of power ? Then they are inspired ; all their measures are infallible ; success awaits upon

upon their steps; and never leaves them, 'till they, and their measures, are put to the trial. But that, which no prophet inspires, that, which is suggested by the ready Dæmon of discord, is to excite, to cherish, to strengthen, resistance in America; is to hamper, to fetter, administration at home: And then, my Lord, what a triumph in demanding—" *Are the*
" measures pursued the means, to prevent
" America becoming independent !" What satisfaction in replying, with proud diffidence: "*I apprehend not !*" But it is something more than triumph to throw the odium of our own blunders on the shoulders of our enemies: When we, my Lord, by our weakness, and pusillanimity,
" have sacrificed the highest permanent in-
" terest, and the whole majesty, power, and
" reputation of government," to our own
" present relief (y) ;" then, my Lord, to

(y) See the protest against the repeal of the stamp-act, signed by four Dukes, thirteen Earls,
 five

charge all this upon our enemies; to accuse them of having done, what we did for them; of having made us "*the contempt of ourselves, and the mockery of Europe,*" Oh, my Lord, this is such a triumph, as, besides ourselves, no man, I should have thought, could ever have conceived; had I not remembered, that the creative genius of a Dryden had made his spirit Melanax shake the glaſs of Malicorne,

—And preach on purpose

To make him loſe the moment of his prayer(z).

"*But to return to the learned Lord.*"
 "Having ſet up independency, and upon
 "what grounds you have ſhewn, as the ob-
 "ject of America, his Lordſhip argued, that
 "the Rubicon was paſſed; that we ſhould
 "kill the Americans, or the Americans

Second
 argument
 of the
 Earl of
 Mansfield
 ſtated;

five Viſcounts, eight Barons, and three Biſhops.
 But what is ſuch a proteſt, when compared with
 the ſolitary proteſt of my noble author!

(z) See Duke of Guiſe, act V.

"would

*" would kill us ; and that we could not look
 " back, but must look forward ; though our
 " destruction be certain and inevitable."*

with can-
 dor and
 judgment.

Every part of your Lordship's work, is, as the French term it, *marqué au bon coin*. Each has its peculiar and characteristic excellence. When you give your own thoughts, the flash of pun supplies the fire of genius ; the quaintness of antithesis spares us the labour of collecting, comparing, and compounding ideas ; and apt alliteration stands in the stead of stile. But, in summing up the arguments of our adversary, these beauties would be displayed à pure perte. All that is required, on these occasions, is candor, and judgment. And in candor and judgment, your Lordship standeth as unrivalled as our friend Dr. Price in calculations.

Proof of
 candor.

And first, my Lord, as to your candor. Should there be two arguments so directly contrary to, so evidently destructive of, each other, that even idiotism
 itself

itself could scarcely be suspected of adducing both, on the same occasion, to the same audience, on the same day ; yet, as, no doubt, two such arguments were so adduced by the Earl of Mansfield, your Lordship's candor would not permit you to rob him of either. You told us before, my Lord, that he allowed the point of aggressorship to be the point which was then to be settled ; that is, that he allowed it then to be our bounden duty to look back to the beginning of the dispute : and you now tell us, that, at the same time, to the same audience, on the same occasion, he maintained, that we could not look back, but must look forward. A writer, hackneyed in the service of party, would have taken a different method : of two contradictory arguments, he would have considered which could render his adversary most obnoxious ; that he would have retained ; that he would have put into the mouth of his adversary : the other he would have cautiously

tiously suppressed. But your Lordship takes a more manly way; you put them both into his mouth. And our reader has only to recollect, what we have already proved, that the Earl of Mansfield, being a North Briton, cannot have one poor grain of sense, or logic, or memory, to give all due credit to your Lordship's statement of this argument.

roof of
judgment.

Next to your candor, we must admire your Lordship's judgment. For, in stating this part of the Earl of Mansfield's argument, you have judiciously suppress his allusion to the Swedish General; and have made him crudely say, that "*if we do not kill the Americans, the Americans will kill us.*" Had your Lordship been rash enough to relate, that his argument ran thus—"What a Swedish General said to his men in the reign of Gustavus Adolphus, just at the eve of a battle, is extremely applicable to us: pointing to the enemy, who were marching down to engage them, says he, My lads,

“ lads, you see those men: if you do
 “ not kill them, they will kill you:”—
 Had your Lordship been rash enough to
 relate, that he explained his allusion, by
 adding, “ My Lords, if we don’t get the
 “ better of America, America will get
 “ the better of us:”—Had your Lord-
 ship been rash enough to relate, that, to
 determine still more precisely the appli-
 cation of his allusion, he had the malice
 to add—“ We do not fear that they will
 “ attack us at home; but, on the other
 “ hand, consider what will be the fate of
 “ our sugar islands; what will be the
 “ fate of our trade to that country: con-
 “ sider, they have attacked us in Ca-
 “ nada:”—Had your Lordship been rash
 enough to relate all this, no art of mine
 could have thrown that ridicule on his
 speech, with which your Lordship, by
 your judicious suppression, has tried to
 overwhelm it.

As a farther proof of your Lordship’s Farther
proof of
judgment.
 judgment, and indeed of your candor too,

the reader should be told, that, if you have judiciously suppressed what he did say, you have made him full amends by adding, as judiciously, what he did not say. For you make him say—“*We must go forward, though our destruction be certain and inevitable.*” Nothing could be more judicious than this little sentence, so critically foisted in. It heightens the ridicule of our adversary’s argument, and it prepares the reader for the brilliant paragraph, which closes your Lordship’s remarks on the Earl of Mansfield; and with a due illustration of which I shall close my Commentary (a).

The Earl of Mansfield turns peers into asses.

“*In short he drove us on, until we are all now driven, like so many asses,*

(a) I am aware, that ill natured critics may say this addition is rather a proof of my noble author’s invention, than of his judgment. But to invent is not to create, it is to find. The words, or, at least, the syllables, which compose this sentence, were all in the speech; my noble author found them, connected them, arranged them; and therein consults his judgment.

“ into

“into a pound; and are so impounded,
 “that thirteen shillings land-tax in the
 “pound, nay all the pounds, shillings,
 “and pence in the nation, will not un-
 “pound us. Such is our disgraceful and
 “truly to be lamented situation. The
 “contempt of ourselves, and the mockery
 “of all Europe besides. Bullied by French-
 “men, insulted by Spaniards, memori-
 “alised by Dutchmen: and yet happy if
 “these were the only calamities that we are
 “to suffer.”

I will freely own to your Lordship,
 that, as I drew near to the conclusion of
 your critique on our arch enemy, I felt
 some pain for you. You had been so
 severe, had said so many new things, had
 played so prettily on words; that I was
 apprehensive your force would not hold
 out to give the necessary finish to the
 whole. But, to use the hackneyed
 phrase of Colley Cibber, you have out-
 done your own outdoings: our enemies
 had no reason to dread, our friends no

Beauties
 of this
 passage.

reason to wish, any thing so great. What a force of imagination to trace the distant connection between pounds sterling and pounds manerial! What a beautiful anticlimax closes the description of our disgraces—"the contempt of ourselves: "the mockery of Europe: bullied by "Frenchmen; insulted by Spaniards;" and by Dutchmen—What! pickled! embarrelled!—No! no! worse, a thousand times worse—memorialised! And then, my Lord, with what a sweet simplicity, with what an engaging modesty, do you, with Dogberry cry,

Come! write me down an ass!

But the first, the chief, the great, merit of all, in this divine passage, is its cutting severity against the Earl of Mansfield. Your Lordship had before accused him of the great crime of being incompetent to an undertaking, which he never undertook: of having neglected to
learn

learn the art of war in the Court of King's Bench : of having sought the opinions of a people in their public acts : of having formed his judgment on their dispositions, and inclinations, from the observations of men, who had lived with them, corresponded with them, transacted business with them ; and of other absurdities, equally repugnant to common sense. Having thus lowered him in the opinion of mankind, what remained, but to turn him into an old woman ? Accordingly, your Lordship has converted his collar to the stole, his staff to the wand, of Circe : Thus accoutred, you have placed him in the midst of the Senate : he waves his wand : the bar of the house divides, expands, itself ; forms a pound ; and fast impounds the astonished Peers : again he waves his wand ; their arms are turned to legs ; their hoofs harden ; their ears lengthen ; the human form disappears ; their voice is no longer articulate ; they bray out their

G. 2. griefs.

griefs. Your Lordship, I conceive, like the President of Milton's Pandæmonium, to have been reading one of your speeches; like him too, I conceive, you were surprised, shocked, at the sound of the disgusting bray, instead of the enlivening—"hear him! hear him!" Still more surprised, still more shocked, when your own indignation was express'd by a correspondent bray!—How the distress heightened, my Lord, when the pert Frenchman came, ventre bleu in his mouth, defiance in his looks, and shook the hostile whip: when the grave Spaniard tugged the lengthened ear; and the more phlegmatic Dutchman tortured even that ear, more heavily, by a long memorial—nothing, surely, was ever so picturesque.

Comfort
to my no-
ble au-
thor.

And here, my Lord, I must humbly take my leave. My task is at an end. Happy if I have contributed to write down the now earl of Mansfield. But should the prepossession of the world continue; should his accursed incantations

have

have doomed us irrevocably to herd with
asses; still there is a little comfort re-
maining. We must leave him the

Menumentum ære perennius,

long since erected to him in the breast of
every lover of loyalty, liberty, and law.
We, my Lord, will apply to Dr. Wil-
son; the voice of Stentor you declare
that you possess; to the valor of Achilles
I have proved your title; and to the po-
lite eloquence of Therfites your Thoughts
shall vindicate your claim. To such pre-
tensions the good Doctor will do justice:
He will erect a statue to your Lordship in
another, and a purer, Chapel of St. Ste-
phen. There you may sweetly ogle the
amiable Catharine. *Vivant sanctus Wil-*
loughbeius et sancta Catharina! As the only
reward for this laborious commentary, let
me obtain one favor. Some Cherubs, or
some Pagan Deities, will, as it becomes
them, be employed to support your train
or to adorn your brows. Let some cor-
ner

ner in the group be assigned to me, my
Lord: Let one single line in the inscrip-
tion point to me; and mark, that you
chubby Cherub, or you full blown Bac-
chus, had the honor of being,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's

Most devoted, most faithful

Servant and Commentator,



